

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing and reconsideration of the subject matter identified in caption, as amended, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. §1.111 and in light of the remarks which follow, are respectfully requested.

By the present Amendment, claim 70 has been amended to further define "a silicone compound" and "a hollow silica particle." Support for these amendments can be found in the present specification at page 22, line 30 to page 23, line 5; page 23, lines 30-33; and page 20, lines 25-32. Further, claim 70 has been amended to replace the phrase "a (co)polymer of only a monomer" with --a (co)polymer of at least one monomer--. The term "(co)polymer" means a "polymer or copolymer." It is understood that a copolymer is made from two or more of monomers. That is, a copolymer cannot be made from only one kind of monomer. Claims 30, 31 and 43 have been amended to change their dependency to claim 70. New claims 72-76 have been added. Support for new claims 72-76 can be found in the present specification at page 20, lines 25-32. Claims 1, 13, 60 and 71 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 2-12, 14-29, 32-39, 46-59 and 61-69 were previously canceled. No new matter has been added.

Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 30, 31, 40-45, 70 and 72-76 will be all the claims pending in the application.

I. Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First and Second Paragraphs

Claims 1, 13 and 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. Applicants submit that these rejections are moot in view of the cancellation of claims 1, 13 and 60.

II. Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

a. Claims 1, 60, 70 and 71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0018886 to Matsufuji et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,229,686 to Yoshikawa et al., as evidenced by U.S. Patent No. 4,692,492 to Gunesin. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1, 60 and 71 is moot because these claims have been canceled. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 70 as amended is patentable over the cited references for at least the following reasons.

As disclosed in paragraphs [0200] to [0201] of Matsufuji et al., the particles of Matsufuji et al. are porous particles formed as a result of the cure shrinkage when the molecules of the silicon dioxide are crosslinked with each other to form the particles. Such particle of Matsufuji et al. is not a particle having a single internal space satisfying the formula (V) recited in present claim 70. Thus, the particle of Matsufuji et al. is apparently different from the presently claimed hollow silica particle.

Furthermore, as the Office Action concedes, Matsufuji et al. does not disclose or suggest using a silicone compound in the low refractive-index layer containing the porous particles.

Yoshikawa et al. discloses a silicone compound having a molecular weight of 500 to 2,100 and having an epoxy group or an oxetane group (column 5, lines 56-67). The compounds disclosed at column 7, lines 10 to 14 of Yoshikawa et al., which are cited by the Examiner, are those containing one methacryloyloxypropyl group in one molecule.

On the other hand, the silicone compound defined in present claim 70 has a plurality of (meth)acryloyl groups and has a molecular weight of from 3,000 to 30,000.

The number of (meth)acryloyl groups contained by the presently claimed silicone compound and the molecular weight of the claimed silicone compound are different from the silicone compounds of Yoshikawa et al.

Moreover, Yoshikawa et al. does not rectify the above noted deficiencies of Matsufuji et al.

As such, assuming, *arguendo*, Matsufuji et al. and Yoshikawa et al. are combined, the combination still would not result in the subject matter of present claim 70.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 70 is patentable over Matsufuji et al. in view of Yoshikawa et al., and thus the rejection should be withdrawn.

b. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Matsufuji et al. in view of Yoshikawa et al. and Gunesin, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0077437 to Nakamura. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claim 13.

III. New claims

Newly added claims 72-76 depend from claim 70 and thus are patentable over the cited references at least for the reasons set forth above in Section II.a.

IV. Conclusion

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order and such action is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions concerning this paper or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at her earliest convenience.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17 and 1.20(d) and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: May 17, 2011

By:



Fang Liu, Ph.D.

Registration No. 51283

Customer No. 21839

703 836 6620